UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/771,096	02/02/2004	Adam Leslie Clark	6882P003	2041

8791   7590   04/01/2008
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY
SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040

EXAMINER
TSAI, TSUNO YIN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2624	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/01/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

DETAIL ACTION

Acknowledge of **After Final Amendment** received on 3/17/2008 and made of record.

Acknowledge of amendment to claims 1 and 26.

Response to Arguments

11)

Applicant's argument – Page 7 regarding Yamaguchi does not teach or suggest any table with a "dominant pixel color component" for **each pixel** in an image as disclose in the new amended claims 1 and 26.

Examiner's response – Yamaguchi teaches regarding processing by each pixel in figure 5A part 540 expressly state "compare color codes of each pixel data with priority code table". Examiner sees this as teaching the limitation of the applicant.

Applicant's argument – Page 7 regarding Bormans fails to remedy this deficiency. The Examiner does not point to, nor does Bormans teach or suggest, "creating a frame group table" with a "dominant pixel color component" for each pixel. Thus, the combination of Yamaguchi and Bormans fails to teach or suggest all of the elements of claim 1.

Examiner's response – Yamaguchi teaches creating a frame group table with dominate pixel color components in column 5 lines 6-15, 400 figure 4 part 400, where processing unit create a table/frame group table representing what priority color/dominate pixel color components that has been selected from the region. Examiner sees this as expressly teaching the limitations set by claims 1 and 26.

Applicant's argument – Page 7 regarding Dependent claims 2-25 ultimately depend from independent claim 1 and thus incorporate the limitations of claim 1. Because Yamaguchi and Bormans, alone or in any known combination, fail to teach or suggest "creating a frame group table" as recited in claim 1, dependent claims 2-25 are not obvious over Yamaguchi in view of Bormans.

Examiner's response – Yamaguchi and Bormans combine teaches all the limitation set forth by claims 1 and 26 as discuss above and in the Final Office Action dated on 10/15/2007, such that all dependent claims 2-25 are rejected as well.

Applicant's argument – Page 7 regarding Independent claim 26 of the present application also recites "creating a frame group table" as discussed above in connection with independent claim 1. Thus, because Yamaguchi and Bormans, alone or in any known combination, do not teach or suggest "creating a frame group table"

Examiner's response – Yamaguchi teaches creating a frame group table with dominate pixel color components in column 5 lines 6-15, 400 figure 4 part 400, where processing unit create a table/frame group table representing what priority

color/dominate pixel color components that has been selected from the region.
Examiner sees this as expressly teaching the limitations set by claim 26.

Applicant's argument – Page 8 regarding n addition, one skilled in the art would not
be motivated to combine the teachings of Yamaguchi with the teachings of Bormans
because the two references have completely opposite goals.

Examiner's response – Yamaguchi teaches regarding to image processing data and
Bormans teaches regarding communication of the process image data. Bormans
discloses in the means of communicating the frame group table and the segment
reference pixels over a network to a receiver (10 figure 2, 20 figure 3, 40 figure 5, 40
figure 10, 78-79 figure 11); and at the receiver (78 figure 11), decoding the frame group
table on a pixel-by-pixel basis by scaling the segment reference pixel parameter values
according to each entry in the frame group table of encoded pixel parameter values to
produce decoded pixels comprised of decoded (figure 17) pixel parameter values (10
figure 2, 20 figure 3, 40 figure 5, 40 figure 10, 78-79 figure 11, 78 figure 11, figure 17).
Combine both teaches regarding to the limitation of the claims 1 and 26 and title of the
application, which is transmitting of audio and video information.

Applicant's argument – Page 8-9 regarding Double Patenting.

Examiner's response – Terminal Disclosure filed on 3/17/2008 has been approve and
accepted. However, 35 USC 103 rejection of Final rejection filed on 10/15/2007 still
stands.

/Jingge Wu/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2624